



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

Re

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/964,518 11/05/97 ALVARREZ

R T1-19177

MM42/0831

EXAMINER

WADE JAMES BRADY
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED
PATENT DEPARTMENT M S 219
P O BOX 65547
DALLAS TX 75265

WILLIAMS, A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2811

13

DATE MAILED: 08/31/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
ASSISTANT SECRETARY AND COMMISSIONER OF
PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

MAILED

AUG 31 1999

GROUP 2500

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Paper No. 13

Application Number: 08/96451

Filing Date: 11/5/97

Appellant(s): Alvarrez et al.

Jay M. Cantor
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to appellant's brief on appeal filed 7/8/99.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

Art Unit:

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) *Status of Claims*

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) *Status of Amendments After Final*

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) *Summary of Invention*

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) *Issues*

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) *Grouping of Claims*

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1 to 14 do not stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CAR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims do not stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CAR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

Art Unit:

(8) ClaimsAppealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) Prior Art of Record

The following is a listing of the prior art of record relied upon in the rejection of claims under appeal.

5,559,364

Hojyo

9-1996

(10) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1 to 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). This rejection is set forth in prior Office action, Paper No. 4.

Claims 1 to 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hojyo (U.S. Patent # 5,559,364).

In claim 1, Hojyo (**figures 1 to 13**) specifically figure 1 show a leadframe/stabilizer for use with semiconductor devices, comprising: an electrically conductive leadframe 10 having a central semiconductor die receiving region (**within 14**) and a plurality of leadframe leads 12 extending outwardly from said central die receiving region; a stabilizer 14 extending partially along the length of and on each side of said leadframe leads to improve leadframe planarity; and a die pad mount 11 integral with

Art Unit:

and forming a part of said stabilizer disposed beneath said central semiconductor die receiving region for retaining a semiconductor die thereon.

In claim 2, 7 and 12, Hojyo's stabilizer 14 is made of an insulating material.

In claim 3, 8 and 13, Hojyo's stabilizer 14 is made of an plastic material.

In claim 4, 9 and 14, Hojyo's stabilizer 14 is made of a ceramic material.

In claim 5, Hojyo's die pad mount 11 has a recess in one surface into which a semiconductor die 22 is mounted.

In claim 6, Hojyo (**figures 1 to 13**) specifically figure 1 show a leadframe/stabilizer for use with semiconductor devices, comprising: an electrically conductive leadframe 10 having a central semiconductor die receiving region (**within 14**) and a plurality of leadframe leads 12 extending outwardly from said central die receiving region; a stabilizer 14 extending partially along the length of and on each side of said leadframe leads to improve leadframe planarity; a die pad mount 11 integral with and forming a part of said stabilizer disposed beneath said central semiconductor die receiving region for retaining a semiconductor

Art Unit:

die thereon; a recess in one surface of the die pad mount and a semiconductor die 22 mounted in said recess.

In claim 10, Hojyo (**figures 1 to 13**) specifically figure 1 show a method for stabilizing the leads of a lead frame and providing a semiconductor die mount pad, comprising the steps of: providing a leadframe 10 having a central semiconductor die receiving region (**within 14**) and a plurality of leadframe leads 12 extending outwardly from said central die receiving region; adhering a stabilizer 14 along part of the length and on each side of said leadframe leads to improve leadframe planarity; and forming a die pad 11 integral with said stabilizer disposed beneath said central semiconductor die receiving region.

In claim 11, Hojyo forms a recessed area in the die pad 11 for mounting of a semiconductor die 22 in said recessed area.

(11) Response to Argument

Appellant's arguments commence on page 3 in the brief beginning with 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

The Examiner takes issue with the narrow interpretation set forth by Appellant in the view of a leadframe/stabilizer structure. The Examiner is interested in determining the claimed structure for which Appellant seeks protection. The Examiner

Art Unit:

certainly has the right to interpret "a stabilizer extending partially along the length of and on each side of said leadframe leads to improve leadframe planarity, said stabilizer including: a die pad mount integral with and forming a part of said stabilizer disposed beneath said central semiconductor die-receiving region for retailing a semiconductor die thereon" loosely given that Appellant has done so. Hojyo shows this stabilizer 14 being formed around the central semiconductor die receiving region (within 14).

The Examiner is interested finding the final structure claimed by Applicant. The reference does show the references as detailed above. Note that Appellant has taken a very narrow interpretation by limiting the teaching of Hojyo. The reference discloses Applicant's invention as claimed.

For the reasons above the rejections of claims 1 to 14 under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) by Hojyo should be sustained.

Art Unit:

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Alexander O. Williams
Primary Examiner
A. U. 2811

AOW
August 30, 1999